

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program*

### *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011*

---

<b>Applicant</b>	City of Ontario	<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$6,800,000
<b>Proposal Title</b>	New Model Colony Storm Drain Project	<b>Total Proposal Cost</b>	\$13,600,000

---

#### PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The proposal contains a single project: New Model Colony Storm Drain Project. The New Model Colony Storm Drain Project is a part of a long term planned solution to a regional storm water flood risk condition in an unimproved agricultural preserve in the City of Ontario's New Model Colony (NMC). Stormwater conveyance is critical to the overall regional improvement of storm drain risk management. The Project provides stormwater drainage improvements on three arterial roadways within the New Model Colony area with a combination of source control, low impact surface retention and treatment features, and drainage conveyance structures.

#### PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	3/12
Budget	2/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	6/12
Schedule	3/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	2/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			31

#### EVALUATION SUMMARY

##### Work Plan

The criterion is less than fully addressed or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. A table with an abstract and project status is not included in the Proposal. The "Purpose and Need" section notes that "By implementing a part of this treatment train, from on-site BMPs to regional stormwater treatment BMPs, as well as storm drain facilities, this project aims to provide an integrated approach in meeting NPDES requirements..." yet, there is not discussion of these facilities in the Budget or Schedule. A regional and Project map were provided, and outlines of the Project limits are included; however, there are no detail provided on where the storm drains are to be constructed or any other construction location details. In the Work Plan, page 1, the main point of concern for Edison Avenue would be a ½ mile east/west of Archibald

Ave. Yet, on page 4 of the Work Plan, the table associates 16,132 feet of roadway with Edison Avenue, and the plans submitted for Edison Avenue are for the entire road length, making it unclear as to how much of Edison Avenue is actually included in the Project. Some main water bodies called out in the description of the Work Plan were Cucamonga Creek channel and Prado Basin, yet they are not shown on the maps. Many of the tasks are missing deliverables. CEQA documents were provided; however, the document cited is the General Plan EIR adopted in January 2010. There is no discussion about any Project specific environmental documentation. Task 7 status (Permitting) on page 1 of Completed Work states that the 401 and 404 permits determinations were included in the completed connection, but documentation was not provided. There is significant level of detail in the detailed Budget that should be reflected in the Work Plan. Specifications were stated as “ongoing” were not provided; however, design drawings were included.

### **Budget**

The criterion for the Budget was marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. A detailed Project Budget and summary was provided; however, the summary descriptions did not provide clear explanations. For example, time equivalents for staff involvement were stated as 0.15 or 0.1 PY; however, there were no descriptions or examples of how those time equivalents were calculated. Disciplines, hours, and hourly wages per discipline were not included; instead, a blended rate consisting of a variety of staff positions was given, without supporting documentation. The design task Budget does not explain why it will take \$220,000 to bring the design plans from 90% and 95% to construction bid documents, or why they will need to select a consultant for this work. The Budget Narrative notes in Row (d) Construction / Implementation, that “the Project’s Engineer Cost Estimate for Construction of the Project is estimated at \$5,429,215”; however, this is the cost for Phase 1 only. The construction category contained more information than was given in the Work Plan with relation to construction items for Phase I, II, and III; however, there is no supporting documentation to justify the construction unit cost estimates, and there was no mention of the NSBB or CDS Units cited in the Work Plan. In addition, there was no supporting documentation for Categories E, F, G, or H.

### **Schedule**

The criterion is not entirely consistent with the Work Plan and Budget, and demonstrates a readiness to begin construction between six and 12 months after the award date. The Schedule for the Archibald Avenue design is not reasonable. The Schedule is more detailed than the Work Plan and Budget, but is difficult to evaluate. For example, Task 9.2 in the Work Plan – Construction, cannot be compared to the Schedule because the tasks are not listed or numbered. In addition, the Schedule provides a breakdown of three construction phases for Archibald, Haven, and Edison Avenue; however, the Work Plan does not break down construction by phases.

### **Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures**

The criterion is marginally addressed, and documentation and rationales are incomplete and insufficient. When claiming water quality benefits, it would be appropriate to include water quality sampling to verify this benefit is achieved. A baseline should be established when comparing pre-project vs. post-project benefits. Outcome indicators and targets for improved regional flood protection and sustainable flood water management are not clearly explained. The proposed targets are not measurable. For example, in the targets column it is stated that the applicant will compare post-project maintenance costs to “other similar improved roadway areas”. It would be more appropriate to compare pre-project maintenance costs to that of post-project maintenance costs of the same project. Overall, the monitoring and performance measures were too general where they should have been specific to the individual Project and objective.

### **Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits**

Only low levels of Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal, based on the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation. Output from an FDR analysis was displayed in Table 12, and demonstrates that the present value of FDR benefits would be just over \$2 million (as compared to a project cost of (\$11.6 million). These FDR benefit estimates appear to be consistent with the other data and assumptions provided in footnotes to Table 11 and in the text. Modeling or other analysis to justify the physical damages avoided with-project was not described.

### **Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits**

Average levels of Water Quality and Other benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis was partially lacking and/or supporting documentation was partially unsubstantiated. Water quality benefits were described as avoided sediment load and other surface pollutants carried by stormwater. They were estimated as equal to the cost of the water quality components of the project, net of maintenance costs, and then escalated over time at 2.5%. This is not an appropriate way to estimate benefits. Other benefits were briefly mentioned but not quantified.

### **Program Preferences**

The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preferences: Effectively Integrate Water Management Programs and Projects within hydrologic region and Practice Integrated Flood Management. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.